



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/710,890

08/11/2004

Chia-Yi Liu

PIIP0007USA

4889

27765

7590

10/30/2008

NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION

P.O. BOX 506

MERRIFIELD, VA 22116

EXAMINER

KOZIOL, STEPHEN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com

Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com

mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<p><b>Application No.</b> 10/710,890</p>	<p><b>Applicant(s)</b> LIU ET AL.</p>	
	<p><b>Examiner</b> STEPHEN R. KOZIOL</p>	<p><b>Art Unit</b> 2624</p>	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: 1-10.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Samir A. Ahmed/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/S. R. K./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding independent claim 1, the combination of Venkat in view of Nakayama is interpreted to teach each and every limitation of at least claim 1. Applicants' submit that neither Venkat nor Nakayama teaches the limitation of "a distance-adjusting module, coupled to the base and the image-analyzing module, for controlling the adjustment device to adjust the distance between the lens and the optical sensor according to the analyzed result." Examiner respectfully disagrees. Nakayama establishes using an image analyzed result (the reference frame F of column 44 lines 56-64) to make various adjustments to the imaging means to better view the image analyzed result (Nakayama, Figure 55 and column 44 lines 33-64). Venkat improves upon the system of Nakayama by teaching that such an adjustment to the imaging means to better view the image can be an adjustment to the distance between a lens and the optical sensor (Venkat column 3 lines 25-30). Both Nakayama and Venkat are in the field of optical imaging devices, so they may be properly combined. Accordingly, the combination of Nakayama and Venkat is interpreted to teach the limitation of "a distance-adjusting module, coupled to the base and the image-analyzing module, for controlling the adjustment device to adjust the distance between the lens and the optical sensor according to the analyzed result" as indicated above.

Regarding independent claim 7, Hanabusa et al. is interpreted to teach each and every limitation of at least claim 7. Applicants' submit that Hanabusa fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "adjusting the distance between the lens and the optical sensor according to the FD...wherein the FD represents focus-value measure based on difference." Examiner respectfully disagrees. In order to better focus an image, Hanabusa teaches focusing means to adjust the distance from the lens to the image forming plane in order to make the image forming plane coincide with the surface of the image sensor (Hanabusa 0184). By making the image forming plane coincide with the surface of the image sensor and adjusting the distance from the lens to the image forming plane, Hanabusa effectually adjusts the distance between the lens and the image sensor based on a unfocused difference measurement (i.e. the present, less than optimally focused distance between the lens and the image sensor). Accordingly Hanabusa may be fairly interpreted to teach the limitation of "adjusting the distance between the lens and the optical sensor according to the FD...wherein the FD represents focus-value measure based on difference" as required by presently amended independent claim 7.